



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 08/474,388    | 06/07/95    | SPRINGER              | T 1011.004000       |

HM11/0731

SAMUEL L FOX  
STERNE KESSLER GOLDSTEIN & FOX  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW STE 600  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3934

| EXAMINER      |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| CUNNINGHAM, T |              |
| ART UNIT      | PAPER NUMBER |
| 1644          |              |

DATE MAILED: 07/31/98

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**08/474,388**Applicant(s)  
**Springer et al.**Examiner  
**Thomas Cunningham**Group Art Unit  
**1644****THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:** [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Jul 6, 1998 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Jul 6, 1998 has been considered with the following effect, but is **NOT** deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☒ will not be entered because:
- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The proposed claim language contains new limitations such as "capable of binding to LFA-1, Mac-1 or p150,95". This affects rejections such as that over the Greve patent.

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

112/2 rejection and rejection under 102 over Dustin.

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: none

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 71-83

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other The rejection over Greve, US patent 5,589,453 must be re-evaluated in view of the amended claim language. The ICAM-1 products in the claimed priority document 07/045,963 are not disclosed to bind to HRV, but may inherently have this ability. If this is found to be the case, this rejection may be dropped.